



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,518	01/26/2001	Pierre Messier	CLW 2 0142	5871
24964	7590	12/01/2005	EXAMINER	
GOODWIN PROCTER L.L.P 103 EISENHOWER PARKWAY ROSELAND, NJ 07068			CHORBAJI, MONZER R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1744	
DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/770,518	Applicant(s) MESSIER ET AL.	
	Examiner MONZER R. CHORBAJI	Art Unit 1744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 52,55,56,62,64-66,69,70,76,78-80,83,84,90,92 and 93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 52,55,56,62,64-66,69,70,76,78-80,83,84,90,92 and 93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final action is in response to the RCE/amendment received on 10/18/2005

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 52, 55-56, 62, 64-66, 69-70, 76, 78-80, 83-84, 90 and 92-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petri (EP 0842 605 A1) in view of Monticello et al (U.S.P.N. 5,891,392).

With respect to claims 52, 66 and 80, the Petri reference discloses a method (page 3, numbered lines 20-21) for spraying a disinfectant composition (page 3, lines 22-23) in aerosol form (page 9, numbered lines 53-54) on inanimate surfaces (page 10, numbered lines 2-10) that includes the following: about 11% by volume of hydrogen peroxide (page 3, numbered lines 44-45 and converting 15% by weight using the density value for hydrogen peroxide at 20 degree Celsius to be 1.45 g/ml), about 12% by volume of Geraniol as antimicrobial active of essential oil (page 3, numbered lines 47-48 and page 4, numbered line 3 and converting 10 % by weight using the density value of Geraniol to be 0.877 g/ml), about 9% by volume of polyacrylic acid as shear thinning polymeric thickener (page 4, numbered lines 10-11, page 4, numbered line 21, page 5, numbered lines 1-3 and converting 10% by weight using the density value for polyacrylic acid of 1.09 g/ml), about 3% by volume of malonic acid as an optional ingredient chelating agent (page 8, numbered lines 52-57 and converting 5% by weight using the density value for malonic acid to be 1.619 g/ml), about 4% by volume of catechol as an optional ingredient radical scavenger (page 9, numbered lines 2, page 9, numbered line 7, page 9, numbered lines 13-15 and converting 5% by weight using the density value for catechol to be 1.3 g/ml), 13% by volume of ethanol as an optional ingredient solvent (page 9, numbered lines 26-27 and converting 10 % by weight using the density value for ethanol at 20 degree Celsius to be 0.79 g/ml, equivalent to the

Art Unit: 1744

flash vaporization component having two carbon atoms) and about 47% by volume of water up to 100% (page 5, numbered lines 45-46). For example, density of Hydrogen peroxide at 20 degree Celsius is 1.45 g/ml. $(15\text{g}) \times (1/1.45 \text{ ml/g}) = 10 \text{ ml}$. The Petri reference further teaches that upon spraying the composition onto a hard surface, no residues (page 10, numbered lines 11-13) are left (equivalent to leaving an essentially dry surface having anti-microbial agent deposited upon). The Petri reference further teaches that the compositions are packaged in spray dispensing containers (page 9, numbered lines 37-54) that intrinsically include spray nozzles for spraying the composition onto hard surfaces in an aerosol form. However, with respect to claims 52, 66 and 80, the Petri reference fails to teach higher concentration values for ethanol. The Monticello reference, which is in the art of designing aqueous hard surface disinfectant compositions that include hydrogen peroxide, teaches the concentration range for ethanol is between 0.1-20% weight (col.2, lines 26-30). For example, based on the Petri composition explained above, 26% by volume of ethanol as an optional ingredient solvent (page 9, numbered lines 26-27 and converting 20 % by weight using the density value for ethanol at 20 degree Celsius to be 0.79 g/ml, equivalent to the flash vaporization component having two carbon atoms) and about 47% by volume of water up to 100% (page 5, numbered lines 45-46). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and composition of the Petri reference by increasing the concentration of ethanol as taught by the Monticello reference since in a concentration range of 0.1-20% weight

ethanol provide an overall reduction in the amount of volatile organic materials while providing surprisingly excellent disinfecting properties (col.2, lines 38-41).

With respect to claims 55-56, 69-70 and 83-84, the Petri reference teaches including ethanol (page 9, numbered lines 26-27) in the disinfectant composition.

With regard to claims 62, 76 and 90, the Petri reference discloses a method (page 3, numbered lines 20-21) for spraying a disinfectant composition (page 3, lines 22-23) in aerosol form (page 9, numbered lines 53-54) on inanimate surfaces (page 10, numbered lines 2-10) that includes about 11% by volume of hydrogen peroxide (page 3, numbered lines 44-45 and converting 15% by weight using the density value for hydrogen peroxide at 20 degree Celsius to be 1.45 g/ml).

With respect to claims 64-65, 78-79 and 92-93, the Petri reference teaches including ethanol (page 9, numbered lines 26-27) in the disinfectant composition.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 52, 55-56, 62, 64-66, 69-70, 76, 78-80, 83-84, 90 and 92-93 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Monticello reference (newly applied reference), which is in the art of designing aqueous hard surface disinfectant compositions that include hydrogen peroxide, teaches the concentration range for ethanol is between 0.1-20% weight (col.2, lines 26-30). For example, based on the Petri composition explained above, 26% by volume of ethanol as an optional ingredient solvent (page 9, numbered lines 26-27 and converting 20 % by weight using the density value for ethanol at 20 degree Celsius to

be 0.79 g/ml, equivalent to the flash vaporization component having two carbon atoms). Furthermore, based on the above calculations, 15% or 12% by weight as taught by the Monticello reference are equivalents to 20% or 16% by volume respectively.

On page 8 of the Remarks section, applicant argues that, "Since Petri teaches the use of ingredients such as antimicrobial actives of essential oils, polymeric thickeners and optional surfactants which do not vaporize quickly, it teaches away from flash-dry compositions." The examiner disagrees. With regard to essential oils, optional polymeric thickeners and optional surfactants, their inclusion does not mean that the composition of the Petri reference is not a flash-dry composition. In fact, on page 10, numbered lines 11-13, the Petri reference teaches that upon spraying the composition onto a hard surface, no residues are left (equivalent to leaving an essentially dry surface having anti-microbial agent deposited upon).

On page 8 of the Remarks section, applicant argues that, "Petri provides no motivation to select a lower alcohol containing 1 to 6 carbon atoms from a long list of suitable solvents listed in Petri." The examiner disagrees since on page 9 of the Petri reference a limited group of solvents is provided and an explicit teaching that ethanol is one of five compounds that are suitable to be included in the composition.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Belfer et al (U.S.P.N. 6,106,854) reference, the Monticello et al (U.S.P.N. 5,891,392) reference and the Monticello et al (U.S.P.N. 6,106,774) reference


Art Unit: 1744


all disclose adding ethanol to disinfecting compositions in the concentration range of 0.1-20% by weight or 35.0-50% by weight.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONZER R. CHORBAJI whose telephone number is (571) 272-1271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, RICHARD D. CRISPINO can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monzer R. Chorbaji 
Patent Examiner
AU 1744
11/28/2005


RICHARD CRISPINO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700